



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/904,734

07/13/2001

Debasish Banerjee

ROC920010101US1

3372

46797

7590

01/13/2009

IBM CORPORATION, INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW
DEPT 917, BLDG. 006-1
3605 HIGHWAY 52 NORTH
ROCHESTER, MN 55901-7829

EXAMINER

DESAI, RACHNA SINGH

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2176

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

01/13/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/904,734	Applicant(s) BANERJEE ET AL.	
	Examiner RACHNA S. DESAI	Art Unit 2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 October 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5, 6, 9-12, 14-18, 20, 21 and 24-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5-6, 9-12, 14-18, 20-21, and 24-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Arguments filed on 10/21/08.
2. Claims 1-3, 5-6, 9-12, 14-18, 20-21, and 24-27 are pending. Claims 1, 12, and 16 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. **Claims 1-3, 5, 9, 12, 14, 16-18, 20, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant Admitted Prior Art in Applicant's Specification (paragraphs 8, 9, and 35) ("AAPA") in view of Veditz et al. ("Veditz"), US Patent No. 6,496,793.**

Regarding claim 12, AAPA teaches a server computer system connected to at least one client computer, the server computer system comprising a memory containing

a code-set program and at least one processor, wherein the processor, when executing the code-set program (see Specification, paragraphs 8, 9, and 35).

is configured to:

determine if a request header composed according to a network communications received with a client request from the at least one client computer designates a character set (See Specification, paragraphs 8, 9, and 35, specifically paragraph 8 where Appellants admit that the HTTP specification contains an optional header that may contain character set information. While use of the header by a client is optional, a fully compliant HTTP server receiving an HTTP request must still determine if a request header (the Content-Type header) composed according to a network communications protocol (HTTP) received with a client request from the at least one client computer designates a character set).

if the request header does not designate the character set:

(i) retrieve locale information from the client request (See Specification, paragraphs 8, 9, and 35. Specifically in paragraph 35 Appellant admits that determining that a client request does not designate a character set, a well known API, developed by Sun Microsystems may be invoked to retrieve locale information from the client request in order to determine an associated character set).

(ii) associate the locale information with a character set (See Specification, paragraphs 8, 9, and 35. Specifically in paragraph 35 Appellant admits that determining that a client request does not designate a character set, a well known API, developed

by Sun Microsystems may be invoked to retrieve locale information from the client request in order to determine an associated character set).

Examiner Note: BPAI decision on 09/05/07 stated all the above features of claim 12 were admitted prior art in Applicant's specification.

AAPA does not teach; however, Veditz teaches

(iii) associating the character set with a code-set converter designation, wherein the code-set converter designation is contained in a lookup table and is mapped in the lookup table with the character set, and wherein a code-set converter designation maps characters of the character set to corresponding characters of the code-set converter designation while processing the request. (See fig. 2B and 2C – i.e. “LDID Value”; see also col. 13, lines 1-67 to col. 14, lines 1-62 where each character set is associated with a code-set designation in a lookup table that maps the associations).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have incorporated Veditz' lookup table associating the character set with a code-set converter designation in the prior art system disclosed in Applicant's Specification because it permits a user to create an information file in his or her own locale without regard to the requirements of other systems which may need access to the same data from that file. Such a system allows users to not only create but also freely exchange data files irrespective of National Language Support Requirements. See column 2 and column 3, lines 1-11.

Independent claims 1 and 16 incorporate substantially similar subject matter as independent claim 12, and are rejected along the same rationale. Claims 1 and 16 are

Markush-type claims containing two alternative series of steps, (a) and (b). The series of steps in (a) substantially correspond to the steps performed by the computer program of claim 12.

Regarding claim 2, AAPA teaches *the network communications protocol used to make the client request and the server response comprises the HTTP*. (See Specification, paragraphs 8, 9, and 35, specifically paragraph 8 where Appellants admit that the HTTP specification contains an optional header that may contain character set information. While use of the header by a client is optional, a fully compliant HTTP server receiving an HTTP request must still determine if a request header (the Content-Type header) composed according to a network communications protocol (HTTP) received with a client request from the at least one client computer designates a character set).

Claim 17 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claim 2, and is rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding claims 3 and 18, Veditz teaches associating comprises accessing a character set lookup table that maps the locale information to the request character set designation and response request character set designation, respectively (see Fig. 2C – “LDID Lookup Table;” see also col. 4, lines 36-39 – i.e., code page). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have

incorporated Veditz' lookup table associating the character set with a code-set converter designation in the prior art system disclosed in Applicant's Specification because it permits a user to create an information file in his or her own locale without regard to the requirements of other systems which may need access to the same data from that file. Such a system allows users to not only create but also freely exchange data files irrespective of National Language Support Requirements. See column 2 and column 3, lines 1-11.

Regarding claims 5, 14, and 20, Veditz teaches wherein the locale information contains a cultural language preference identifier (see col. 11, lines 5-18 – The user may specify language preferences (i.e. default values)).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have incorporated Veditz' lookup table associating the character set with a code-set converter designation in the prior art system disclosed in Applicant's Specification because it permits a user to create an information file in his or her own locale without regard to the requirements of other systems which may need access to the same data from that file. Such a system allows users to not only create but also freely exchange data files irrespective of National Language Support Requirements. See column 2 and column 3, lines 1-11.

Regarding claims 9 and 24, Veditz teaches wherein the code-set converter designation is indicative of user specific implementations of character sets (see Fig. 2C; col. 12, lines 37-42 et seq).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have incorporated Veditz' lookup table associating the character set with a code-set converter designation in the prior art system disclosed in Applicant's Specification because it permits a user to create an information file in his or her own locale without regard to the requirements of other systems which may need access to the same data from that file. Such a system allows users to not only create but also freely exchange data files irrespective of National Language Support Requirements. See column 2 and column 3, lines 1-11.

5. Claims 6, 10, 11, 21, 26, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant Admitted Prior Art in Applicant's Specification (paragraphs 8, 9, and 35) ("AAPA") in view of Veditz et al. ("Veditz"), US Patent No. 6,496,793 and further in view of Horn et al., ("Horn"), US PG PUB No. 2002/0156688.

Regarding claim 6, Veditz/Watanabe teach a method of determining character sets of client-server communications with respect to independent claim 1 as discussed above, but does not specifically teach the character set designations containing an IANA character set parameter.

However, Horn teaches the character set designations containing an IANA character set parameter (see [178]) for the purpose of preserving the central coordinating functions of the global Internet for the public good.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of AAPA/Veditz with the teachings of Horn to include the character set designations containing an IANA character set parameter for the purpose of preserving the central coordinating functions of the global Internet for the public good.

Regarding claims 10 and 11, AAPA/Veditz teach a method of determining character sets of client-server communications with respect to independent claim 1 as discussed above, but do not specifically teach converting the client request into Unicode characters and converting the response from the Unicode characters to the character set associated with the locale information.

However, Horn teaches the use of Unicode, a fixed-width, 16-bit worldwide character-encoding standard for the purpose of simplifying localization of software and improving multilingual text processing (see [0293]).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of AAPA/Veditz with the teachings of Horn to include converting the client request into Unicode characters and converting the response from Unicode characters to the character set associated with the locale

information standard for the purpose of simplifying localization of software and improving multilingual text processing.

Claim 21 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claim 6, and is rejected along the same rationale.

Claim 26 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claim 10, and is rejected along the same rationale.

Claim 27 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claim 11, and is rejected along the same rationale.

6. Claims 15 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant Admitted Prior Art in Applicant's Specification (paragraphs 8, 9, and 35) ("AAPA") in view of Veditz et al. ("Veditz"), US Patent No. 6,496,793, and further in view of Kan et al., ("Kan"), US PG PUB No. 2003/0088544.

Regarding claims 15 and 25, AAPA in view of Veditz, teach the system with respect to claim 12 as discussed above, but does not specifically teach a JVM code-set converter.

However, Kan teaches a peer-to-peer network executing on a Java Virtual Machine (JVM) for the purpose of providing inter-operability between compliant software components (see [0298], [0315]).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teaching of AAPA, in view of Veditz, with the teachings of Kan to include a JVM for the purpose of providing interoperability between compliant software components.

7. Claims 1, 3, 5, 9, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Veditz et al. ("Veditz"), US Patent No. 6,496,793, in view of Watanabe et al. ("Watanabe"), US Patent No. 6,185,729.

Veditz teaches a method of determining character sets (see Abstract):

Independent Claim 1

comprising **at least one of:**

(a) selecting a character set for a client request from a client to a server, the selecting comprising:

determining whether the client request includes a request character set designation (Fig. 3A - 303 checks LDID in data file (i.e. stored in header file); Fig. 2C - file header);

if the client request does not include the request character set designation, retrieving locale information contained in the client request (Fig. 3B – compares LDID of the data file to Active LDID; see also col. 3, lines 29-31); and

selecting a character set to assign to the request character set designation by associating the locale information with the request character set designation using mapping data located on the server (Fig. 2B – if Active LDID is not equal to Local LDID it maps the Local LDID into the Active LDID; see also col. 3, lines 54-60; col. 7, lines 52-64; col. 18, lines 21-26); and

associating the request character set designation with a first code-set converter designation, wherein the first code-set converter designation is contained in a lookup table and is mapped in the lookup table with the character set assigned to the request character set designation, and wherein a first code-set converter corresponding to the first code-set converter designation maps characters of the request character set designation to corresponding characters of the first code-set converter designation while processing the request. (See fig. 2B and 2C – i.e. “LDID Value”; see also col. 13, lines 1-67 to col. 14, lines 1-62 where each character set is associated with a code-set designation in a lookup table that maps the associations).

(b) selecting a response character set for a response from the server to the client, the selecting comprising:

determining whether the server response includes a response character set designation (Fig. 3A – 303 checks LDID in data file (i.e. stored in header file); Fig. 2C – file header);

if the server response does not include the response character set designation, retrieving locale information contained in the server response (Fig 3B - compares LDID of data file to Active LDID; see also col. 3, lines 29-31); and

selecting a character set to assign to the response character set designation by associating the locale information contained in the server response with the response character set designation using the mapping data (Fig. 2B – if Active LDID is not equal to Local LDID it maps the Local LDID into the Active LDID; see also col. 3, lines 54-60; col. 7, lines 52-64; col. 18, lines 21-26).

associating the response character set designation with a second code-set converter designation, wherein the second code-set converter designation is contained in a lookup table and is mapped in the lookup table with the character set assigned to the response character set designation, and wherein a second code-set converter corresponding to the second code-set converter designation maps characters of the response character set designation to corresponding characters of the second code-set converter designation while processing the response. (See fig. 2B and 2C – i.e. “LDID Value”; see also col. 13, lines 1-67 to col. 14, lines 1-62 where each character set is associated with a code-set designation in a lookup table that maps the associations).

Veditz does not specifically teach client-server communications, including using a network communication protocol. However, Watanabe teaches a method and system

for developing and testing internationalized software including a multibyte English locale directed to a network communication protocol for the purpose of transferring locale information over computer networks (see col. 5 lines 34-46, col. 6, lines 8-28).

A network is fundamentally a distributed architecture system in which software is split between client-server tasks. A client sends requests to a server, according to some communications protocol, asking for information or action, and the server responds. A network communication protocol is a hardware or software standard that governs data transmission between computers. The term "protocol" is very generic and is used for hundreds of different communication methods. Therefore, if not inherent, at the very least it was obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made that a network includes client-server communications, communications protocols, client requests or server responses.

Thus it would have been obvious at the time of the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the teaching of Veditz with the teachings of Watanabe to include client-server communications, including using a network communication protocol for the purpose of transferring locale information over computer networks from a server to a client – since a network is fundamentally a client/server architecture for sending and receiving information.

Independent claims 12 and 16 incorporate substantially similar subject matter as independent claim 1, and are rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding claims 3 and 18, Veditz teaches associating comprises accessing a character set lookup table that maps the locale information to the request character set designation and response request character set designation, respectively (see Fig. 2C – “LDID Lookup Table;” see also col. 4, lines 36-39 – i.e., code page).

Regarding claims 5, 14, and 20, Veditz teaches wherein the locale information contains a cultural language preference identifier (see col. 11, lines 5-18 – The user may specify language preferences (i.e. default values).

Regarding claims 9 and 24, Veditz teaches wherein the code-set converter designation is indicative of user specific implementations of character sets (see Fig. 2C; col. 12, lines 37-42 et seq).

8. Claims 2, 6, 10, 11, 17, 21, 26, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Veditz et al. (“Veditz”), US Patent No. 6,496,793, in view of Watanabe et al. (“Watanabe”), US Patent No. 6,185,729, and further in view of Horn et al., (“Horn”), US PG PUB No. 2002/0156688.

Regarding claim 2, Veditz/Watanabe teach a method of determining character sets of client-server communications with respect to independent claim 1 as discussed above, but does not specifically teach the client request and server response being formatted as HTTP.

However, Horn teaches client request and server responses formatted in HTTP (see [109], [156], and [202]) for the purpose of defining how messages are formatted and transmitted, and what actions Web servers and browsers should take in response to various commands.

Since Horn and Veditz are both from the same field of endeavor, the purposes disclosed by Horn would have been recognized in the pertinent art of Veditz. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teaching of Veditz with the teachings of Horn to include client request and server responses formatted in HTTP (see [109], [156], and [202]) for the purpose of defining how messages are formatted and transmitted, and what actions Web servers and browsers should take in response to various commands.

Regarding claim 6, Veditz/Watanabe teach a method of determining character sets of client-server communications with respect to independent claim 1 as discussed above, but does not specifically teach the character set designations containing an IANA character set parameter.

However, Horn teaches the character set designations containing an IANA character set parameter (see [178]) for the purpose of preserving the central coordinating functions of the global Internet for the public good.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Veditz/Watanabe with the teachings of Horn to include the character set designations containing an IANA character set parameter for

the purpose of preserving the central coordinating functions of the global Internet for the public good.

Regarding claims 10 and 11, Veditz/Watanabe teach a method of determining character sets of client-server communications with respect to independent claim 1 as discussed above, but does not specifically teach converting the client request into Unicode characters and converting the response from the Unicode characters to the character set associated with the locale information.

However, Horn teaches the use of Unicode, a fixed-width, 16-bit worldwide character-encoding standard for the purpose of simplifying localization of software and improving multilingual text processing (see [0293]).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Veditz/Watanabe with the teachings of Horn to include converting the client request into Unicode characters and converting the response from Unicode characters to the character set associated with the locale information standard for the purpose of simplifying localization of software and improving multilingual text processing.

Claim 17 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claim 2, and is rejected along the same rationale.

Claim 21 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claim 6, and is rejected along the same rationale.

Claim 26 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claim 10, and is rejected along the same rationale.

Claim 27 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claim 11, and is rejected along the same rationale.

9. Claims 15 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Veditz et al. ("Veditz"), US Patent No. 6,496,793, in view of Watanabe et al. ("Watanabe"), US Patent No. 6,185,729, and further in view of Kan et al., ("Kan"), US PG PUB No. 2003/0088544.

Regarding claims 15 and 25, Veditz, in view of Watanabe, teach the system with respect to claim 12 as discussed above, but does not specifically teach a JVM code-set converter.

However, Kan teaches a peer-to-peer network executing on a Java Virtual Machine (JVM) for the purpose of providing inter-operability between compliant software components (see [0298], [0315]).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teaching of Veditz, in view of Watanabe, with the teachings

of Kan to include a JVM for the purpose of providing interoperability between compliant software components.

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's remarks filed 10/21/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

On pages 9-10, Applicant gives an overview of the current invention. Beginning on page 10 and continuing through page 12, Applicant argues the features rejected under Applicant Admitted Prior Art. Under the principles of res judicata and collateral estoppel, applicant is not entitled to claims that are patentably indistinguishable. Since the BPAI has already rendered a decision regarding various features argued by the Applicant, the Examiner will not address these limitations other than to refer to the Decision rendered by the BPAI on 09/05/07 and the Decision on Reconsideration rendered on 03/31/08.

On page 13, Applicant argues the amended features. Specifically, Applicant argues Veditz does not teach *associating the request character set designation with a first code-set converter designation, wherein the first code-set converter designation is contained in a lookup table and is mapped in the lookup table with the character set assigned to the request character set designation, and wherein a first code-set converter corresponding to the first code-set converter designation maps characters of*

the request character set designation to corresponding characters of the first code-set converter designation while processing the request.

Examiner disagrees.

In Fig. 2B and 2C – i.e. “LDID Value”; col. 13, lines 1-67 to col. 14, lines 1-62 Veditz discloses where each character set is associated with a code-set designation in a lookup table that maps the associations.

Veditz also teaches *associating the response character set designation with a second code-set converter designation, wherein the second code-set converter designation is contained in a lookup table and is mapped in the lookup table with the character set assigned to the response character set designation, and wherein a second code-set converter corresponding to the second code-set converter designation maps characters of the response character set designation to corresponding characters of the second code-set converter designation while processing the response.* (See fig. 2B and 2C – i.e. “LDID Value”; see also col. 13, lines 1-67 to col. 14, lines 1-62 where each character set is associated with a code-set designation in a lookup table that maps the associations).

On page 14, Applicant argues Veditz teaches a one-to-one correspondence between a language driver and its LDID but does not disclose anything about mapping from one character set to another character set in general. Examiner disagrees because the LDID value is used to identify a language driver that references a character set therefore Veditz does teach mapping a character set to another character set.

Applicant makes similar arguments with respect to claims 6, 10, 11, 21, 26, and 27 as well as claims 15 and 25. The remarks above also apply to the dependent claims.

On pages 15-16, Applicant argues the second rejection over Veditz in view of Watanabe. Applicant makes a similar assertion with respect to Veditz and its failure to teach mapping one character set to another set. As stated above, Examiner disagrees because the LDID value is used to identify a language driver that references a character set therefore Veditz does teach mapping a character set to another character set. See fig. 2B and 2C – i.e. “LDID Value”; see also col. 13, lines 1-67 to col. 14, lines 1-62 where each character set is associated with a code-set designation in a lookup table that maps the associations.

Applicant further argues Veditz fails to disclose certain limitations that have already been affirmed by the BPAI. Under the principles of res judicata and collateral estoppel, applicant is not entitled to claims that are patentably indistinguishable. Since the BPAI has already rendered a decision regarding various features argued by the Applicant, the Examiner will not address these limitations other than to refer to the Decision rendered by the BPAI on 09/05/07 and the Decision on Reconsideration rendered on 03/31/08.

Regarding the limitation, selecting a character set to assign to the response character set designation by associating the locale information contained in the server response with the response character set designation using the mapping data, Applicant argues this limitation is not taught by Veditz because he teaches a non-

networked system that will intelligently process data objects created under one language driver with those created or modified by another language driver.

Examiner disagrees for reasons stated in the Examiner's Answer and reiterated below.

Veditz teaches— if Active LDID is not equal to Local LDID it maps the Local LDID into the Active LDID which meets the limitation, *selecting a character set to assign to the request character set*; see figure 2b, also col. 3, lines 54-60; col. 7, lines 52-64; col. 18, lines 21-26. Veditz does not specifically teach client-server communications, including using a network communication protocol. However, Watanabe teaches a method and system for developing and testing internationalized software including a multibyte English locale directed to a network communication protocol for the purpose of transferring locale information over computer networks (see col. 5 lines 34-46, col. 6, lines 8-28). A network is fundamentally a distributed architecture system in which software is split between client-server tasks. A client sends requests to a server, according to some communications protocol, asking for information or action, and the server responds. A network communication protocol is a hardware or software standard that governs data transmission between computers. The term "protocol" is very generic and is used for hundreds of different communication methods. Therefore, if not inherent, at the very least it was obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made that a network includes client-server communications, communications protocols, client requests or server responses. Thus it would have been obvious at the time of the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in

the art to modify the teaching of Veditz with the teachings of Watanabe to include client-server communications, including using a network communication protocol for the purpose of transferring locale information over computer networks from a server to a client – since a network is fundamentally a client/server architecture for sending and receiving information.

On pages 17-18, Applicant argues various limitations are not taught by Veditz. Again, the BPAI has already rendered an affirmation regarding these limitations. Therefore, the Examiner will not address these limitations other than to refer to the Decision rendered by the BPAI on 09/05/07 and the Decision on Reconsideration rendered on 03/31/08.

In view of the comments above, the rejections are maintained.

Conclusion

11. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to RACHNA S. DESAI whose telephone number is (571)272-4099. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:30AM-6:00PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Doug Hutton can be reached on 571-272-4137. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Rachna S Desai/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2176
01/12/08